

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending.

This continuation-in-part (CIP) has been filed so that the disclosure could be amended to include subject matter that was deemed new matter in the parent application.

The parent application was made the subject of a restriction requirement. In order to expedite examination of this CIP application, if the same restriction is imposed, Applicant elects the same group of claims that was elected in the parent application. Specifically, applicant elects Claims 1-3.


Also, in order to expedite examination, the following arguments are provided in response to the March 26, 2003 Office Action, which was the last office action mailed in the parent application. In the Action, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs, for use of the term "hepatrophic media". In response to these rejections the Examiner is reminded that Applicant is allowed to be his own lexicographer, as long as Applicant does not use a word with a well known definition in a contrary manner, and Applicant provides a definition of the word in question in the specification. In this case, the word in question is "hepatrophic". This word does not have a well established definition in the art, so Applicant is not using the word in a contrary manner. Further, Applicant provides a clear definition of the word in the specification. Specifically, "hepatrophic" is defined at the top of page 4 and the top of page 5 of the specification as a media that "provides any required purification (or disinfecting) due to back wash from the user." Also on pages 4 and 5 of the specification, a specific example of a hepatrophic media is provided, specifically the iodine matrix known in the art as I-3. The Examiner contends that the term hepatrophic does not define what other materials are represented by the term in question. However, based on the definition provided in the specification, Applicant contends that one or ordinary skill in the art of water purification devices will know what materials are used to disinfect the back wash from a user, as this is a common problem in devices where a user drinks directly from the purifying device. For all of the above reasons, these rejections are believed to have been overcome.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is

respectfully requested. If any questions remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Seto Patents

By:

  
Jeffrey K. Seto  
Registration No. 43,419

617 Tinkerbell Rd.  
Chapel Hill, NC 27517  
(919) 960-8836

Date: 7-28-03